UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-EIGHTH YEAR

2442nd MEETING: 25 MAY 1983

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2442) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in Namibia:

Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);

Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2442nd MEETING

Held in New York on Wednesday, 25 May 1983, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. M. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire).

Present: The representatives of the following States: China, France, Guyana, Jordan, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Poland, Togo, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2442)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
   Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
Letter dated 12 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15760);
Letter dated 13 May 1983 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/15761)

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the representative of Mauritius to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ramlogun (Mauritius) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite the President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take places at the Security Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Lusaka (President of the United Nations Council for Namibia) and the other members of the delegation took places at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with the decision taken at the 2439th meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma, President of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2439th to 2441st meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Canada, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gambia, the Federal Republic of Germany, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Morocco, Mozambique, Nigeria, Panama, Romania, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania, the Upper Volta, Yugoslavia and Zambia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Hadj Azzout (Algeria), Mr. de Figueiredo (Angola), Mr. Joseph (Australia), Mr. Wasiuddin (Bangladesh), Mr. Adjibade (Benin), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Pelletier (Canada), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Khalil (Egypt), Mr. Ibrahim (Ethiopia), Mr. Blain (Gambia), Mr. van Well (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Kaba (Guinea), Mr. Rao (India), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Wabuge (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Burwin (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Traore (Mali), Mr. Mrani Zentar (Morocco), Mr. Lobo (Mozambique), Mr. Fafowora (Nigeria), Mr. Ozores Typaldos (Panama), Mr. Marinescu (Romania), Mr. Niasse (Senegal), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. Sallu (Sierra Leone), Mr. Adan (Somalia), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Fonseka (Sri Lanka), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Slim (Tunisia), Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Mr. Otunnu (Uganda), Mr. Rupia (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Bassole (Upper Volta), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia) and Mr. Goma (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bulgaria, Chile and Venezuela in which they request to be invited to take part in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite them to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Trucco (Chile) and Mr. Martini Urdaneta (Venezuela) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Members of the Council have before them document S/15781 containing the text of a letter dated 20 May 1983 from the representative of Mauritius to the President of the Council.

7. The first speaker is the representative of Kuwait. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

8. Mr. ABULHASSAN (Kuwait) (*interpretation from Arabic*): I should like at the outset, Sir, to convey to you our congratulations on your assumption of the lofty position of President of the Council for this month. We are confident that your wise and able leadership will be an asset to the Council in its work.

9. I should also like to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mrs. Jeane Kirkpatrick, who demonstrated remarkable qualities during her presidency of the Council in the month of April.

10. Kuwait attaches great importance to the current debate on the situation in Namibia. Regrettably, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait was unable to participate in person in these proceedings and he entrusted me with the important task of representing him and supporting the joint action undertaken by his African and non-aligned colleagues especially mandated by the Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983 [*see S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2*].

11. Following the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, the deliberations of the Council on the situation in Namibia are yet another instance where the international community is emphasizing its quest for peace and justice for the Namibian people, which has suffered for too long from military occupation, political suppression and economic exploitation. It is a quest for justice for a people which has repeatedly been denied the opportunity to enjoy prospects of freedom and self-determination. It is a quest that we, with anguish, compare to the quest for peace, justice and self-determination for the Palestinian people, who have shared the same plight and suffered similar conditions.

12. By these deliberations the international community is once again demonstrating its deep concern about the fate of decisions taken by this body and the erosion of a commitment undertaken unanimously five years ago by members of the Council, which then comprised the five members of the contact group. It would be exceedingly dangerous if the Council were diverted from fulfilment of its primary responsibility to ensure full implementation of its resolution 435 (1978). It is the sacred duty of the Council to reaffirm its resolve to seek a just solution of the Namibian problem based on resolution 435 (1978). That resolution, in the view of Kuwait, remains the basis for a peaceful settlement. Any deviation from its provisions and those of other relevant United Nations resolutions would be at the expense and to the detriment of the Namibian people.

13. We share the Secretary-General's profound concern, expressed in his latest report, at the possibility that "factors which lie outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978) should hamper its implementation" [*S/15776, para. 19*]. We refer, in particular, to the United States attempt to establish a linkage between Namibian independence and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. In general, especially after listening to the statement by the representative of the United Kingdom [*2439th meeting*], we are referring to the fact that the other members, with the exception of France, have not been forthright in denouncing that policy, which in our view undermines the efforts to ensure implementation of the United Nations plan according to resolution 435 (1978). This can only be regarded as encouraging South Africa in pursuing its delaying tactics with regard to a negotiated settlement. Furthermore, that policy denies a sovereign State, Angola, its inherent right to adopt measures to strengthen its security. We therefore reject that policy of linkage. We must not fail to commend France, a member of the contact group, for dissociating itself from that policy, as it confirmed recently at the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence.[1] We believe that such a constructive position helps to emphasize the basic issue and facilitates the negotiating process, instead of injecting extraneous matters.

14. The five Western countries took upon themselves the responsibility for pursuing efforts to ensure implementation of resolution 435 (1978). While reaffirming the primary responsibility of the United Nations, and in particular the responsibility of the Council, to bring about the implementation of the independence plan for Namibia, we cannot but emphasize the role of the contact group in making this a reality. We have been assured by one member, the United Kingdom, that they intend to persevere and to succeed. We can only hope that they will take meaningful action in the fulfilment of their self-appointed role.

15. So far, the situation has been disheartening; it remains a source of comfort only to South Africa. The *apartheid* régime continues to thrive in a situation free of pressure. It has been assured repeatedly that the international community will not collectively apply any real sanctions. As recently as the beginning of this debate, we heard with dismay that sanctions would not reinforce the negotiation process, and we have the United States Administration advocating a policy of so-called constructive engagement. That policy constitutes an obstacle and only reinforces a régime bent on imposing its will on the international community. We had a demonstration of that only yesterday. That régime is bent on imposing its own interpretation of the settlement plan. It has indicated its idea of the form of government Namibia should have. It has been indicated as well what allies and what political régimes the neighbouring States should have.

16. The sacrifices made by the front-line States at a time when they have been the victims of direct military aggression, political intervention and economic destabilization have been staggering.

17. South Africa's persistence in pursuing these policies against the front-line States was demonstrated recently by its act of aggression against Mozambique. Kuwait condemns that wanton aggression, which is yet another manifestation of the animosity of the Pretoria régime against independent African States. Pretoria's apparent willingness to negotiate a peaceful settlement will be viewed with suspicion as long as it persists in following a militaristic policy.

18. We believe that one way of strengthening the negotiating process is to bring pressure to bear on the intransigent party. Such action is not beyond the skill of the members of the Council, especially those directly concerned with that process. We have noted with satisfaction the efforts of the Scandinavian countries and the success their initiative has brought about in the field of investment. Kuwait is co-operating with other States in imposing sanctions and enforcing the oil embargo against South Africa. Kuwait observes and supports comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria régime, and we will not hesitate to co-operate with others in the search for effective means of bringing pressure to bear on South Africa.

19. We have seen a liberation movement resolutely avoiding the military option in order to contribute to the success of the negotiating process. SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people, has borne with patience all the tactics aimed at obstructing a negotiated settlement. We call upon the Western States to demonstrate their good will by adopting a pragmatic position. The current deliberations of the Council constitute an opportunity for those countries to reinforce not merely their commitment to a negotiating process, not merely the effectiveness of the Council, but their own credibility in professing their objective—and may that objective be a free and independent Namibia.

20. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Benin, Mr. Tiamiou Adjibade. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

21. Mr. ADJIBADE (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): We are happy to convey to you, Mr. President, our great satisfaction at seeing you occupying the position of President of this body in which, in the recent past, your brilliant eloquence was employed to denounce the injustices of our world.

22. Your experience, your great diplomatic talents, the high posts you have occupied in your great and beautiful country, Zaire, and particularly your quality as an African all represent valuable assets in conducting successfully the work of the Council at such a crucial time, when it is debating once again the disturbing question of Namibia.

23. We should like, above all, to express to the Secretary-General our great appreciation for the clarity and impartiality of his comments and the relevance and courage of the conclusions he reaches in his report on the question of Namibia [*S/15776*]. If we may be permitted to express a hope, it is that the important contribution of the Secretary-General will inspire the Council to conduct constructive discussions which will lead to the immediate and effective exercise by the oppressed Namibian people of their inalienable right.

24. Finally, we should like to express our pleasure at the presence among us in this chamber of that great freedom fighter, our brother Sam Nujoma. The important statement that he made before the Council [*2439th meeting*], with his characteristic judiciousness, is significant and instructive. His determination and vigilance, together with the selflessness of the fighting people of Namibia, constitute the surest guarantee of the success of the arduous struggle being waged so heroically by SWAPO.

25. Once again defying the international community, at the precise moment when this new debate on Namibia, this indictment of the crimes and abominations so cynically perpetrated by South Africa, is taking place, the Pretoria Fascists are once again demonstrating their passion for destabilization and aggression by unleashing their murderous hordes of outlaws against the peaceful people of Mozambique.

26. Although the feeling of the international community on the question of Namibia is unanimous—that is to say, that the Namibian people, like the other colonized peoples of yester-year, should be allowed to exercise freely their lawful right to self-determination and independence—we fear that these deliberations may once again serve merely as an opportunity for proclamations of good faith behind which are concealed the hypocrisy and cold calculations of those who in the past have encouraged, and continue to encourage, the procrastinators of Pretoria to persist in their outrageous defiance of the international community.

27. Since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, terminating South Africa's Mandate over Namibia, the Organization has constantly sought and proposed solutions designed to restore to the Namibian people their inalienable rights. However, today, in 1983, nothing has changed; the Namibian people are still oppressed and deprived of their elementary rights and have imposed upon them the most atrocious foreign domination of the present era.

28. This disquieting fact prompts us to ask more than one tragic question. How many meetings, conferences, talks, symposiums, seminars or other such things must we hold on this question before the relevant resolutions of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the United Nations itself begin to be put into effect?

29. How many crimes, murders and acts of barbarism, how many acts of aggression and oppression, how much perfidy, how much treachery and how many delaying tactics by the inveterate racists of Pretoria must still be tolerated before an end is finally put to the martyrdom of the Namibian people?

30. What acts of courage, bravery, heroism and selflessness must we still expect from the valiant fighters of SWAPO before the women and children, the elderly and the men of Namibia cease to be pariahs in the land of their ancestors?

31. How much time, how many months or years, must we still wait before the Namibian people are finally able to exercise their sacred right to self-determination, sovereignty, independence and freedom?

32. The Pretoria Fascists are dreaming wild dreams. In their obstinacy they are aiming essentially at blunting the determination of the SWAPO fighters and persuading the international community to bow to their attempts to impose an internal settlement, which, as everyone knows, would amount to the installation of puppets, traitors and other groups in the pay of neo-colonial and racist interests.

33. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, held in Paris from 25 to 29 April 1983, should—in case that should still have been necessary—have dashed these mad dreams.

34. Indeed, in the Paris Declaration on Namibia,[2] the Conference, solemnly proclaiming its unreserved support for the struggle of the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO, the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, condemned the intensification of barbarous repression, the policy of bantustanization and the efforts to destroy the national unity and territorial integrity of Namibia.

35. It condemned the ruthless exploitation of the Namibian people, the shameless plundering of their resources, the militarization of their territory and its use as a base for carrying out acts of aggression against the front-line States, particularly Angola, Zambia and Mozambique, as crimes that have created an extremely dangerous situation in southern Africa, threatening international peace and security.

36. It also denounced all attempts to link the question of Namibia with external problems which have no connection with it, such as the presence of Cuban forces in Angola.

37. Above all, the Conference reaffirmed its attachment to the United Nations plan for Namibia approved in resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), which the Council had laid down as the basis for a peaceful settlement which would be universally accepted.

38. Resolution 435 (1978), formulated and negotiated with the assistance of all parties concerned, appeared to be a compromise capable of winning the support of all parties. Unfortunately, although South Africa had been consulted and had given its consent at all stages of negotiation of the settlement plan approved in resolution 435 (1978), it continues illegally to occupy Namibian territory, five years after the adoption of that resolution by the Council, thus persisting in its defiance of the Organization.

39. This unacceptable defiance and arrogance on the part of a régime which has been outlawed by the international community gives rise to doubt as to the capacity of the Organization to translate into actions and deeds its own unanimously accepted decisions. The persistent defiance and arrogance of South Africa not only are an insult to the whole international community but also reflect above all the inability of the Council, and more particularly the weakened political will of the great Powers, to intervene promptly and effectively when peace, stability and international security are seriously threatened.

40. No matter how profound and incurable its political blindness may be, no matter how impressive may be its military arsenal of oppression, South Africa would not persist in its defiant attitude if it were not assured of the culpable benevolence of certain allied Powers.

41. When one considers the vehemence with which certain States condemn that which, in other circumstances and in their view, constitutes action prejudicial to human rights, one can only wonder about the justification of their attitude towards a régime which has elevated to a system of government the denial of the most elementary human rights. One can only be indignant at the misuse of the right of veto in the Council to oppose the adoption of concrete political and economic measures to compel South Africa to withdraw from Namibian territory and spare Namibia the horrors of abominable, inhuman racial discrimination.

42. Given all the precautions which the members of the contact group have contrived to adopt in order to accom-

modate South Africa in their actions designed to prevail upon it to take part in the implementation of the settlement plan, with the formulation of which it was associated and to which it had given its consent, we can only be even more fully convinced that South Africa is just one link in a vast and complex process of exploitation in which the Powers which make up the contact group participate—by means of their firms and their international and multinational corporations. We can thus understand the hesitation or the refusal to exert real, decisive pressure on South Africa.

43. It is easy to realize, in consequence, that the true nature of the struggle being waged by the Namibian people is essentially anti-imperialist, anti-colonialist and anti-racist.

44. The results of five years of effort by the contact group—which we should like to commend—prompt one to think that the optimism-to-order displayed by the Member States concerned and the publicity accompanying each of their actions are nothing but a smoke-screen to camouflage the delaying tactics aimed at imposing a neo-colonial solution on Namibia in order to safeguard selfish political, economic and military interests, sacrificing the rights of the Namibian people in an attempt to obtain recognition, at the international level, for the puppets who, in such a docile and shameful manner, serve the interests of Pretoria.

45. Again, one cannot but believe that, in endorsing the South African demand for granting constitutional guarantees to the white minority in Namibia, the member States of the contact group have actually given their blessing by so doing to a racist policy which wishes to see the whites continuing to enjoy privileges that are denied to the blacks.

46. Only recently, in deciding to grant a credit of one billion of special drawing rights to South Africa, against the will of the international community as clearly expressed in General Assembly resolution 37/2 of 21 October 1982, the International Monetary Fund, dominated as the Council knows, simply made a direct and substantial contribution to the strengthening of the arsenal of repression, oppression and aggression of the neo-Nazis of Pretoria. That decision of the Fund is in itself a defiance of the relevant United Nations resolutions and of international morality; it is also an offence to the conscience of the world, because it is an encouragement of the crime of *apartheid*, an encouragement of a crime against humanity.

47. In sharing with the Council this distressing record on Namibia, the first conclusion to which we are ineluctably driven is the crushing defeat of South Africa in its diabolical designs, despite the size of its resources and the scope of the crimes to which it has resorted. South Africa has been categorically repudiated by the valiant Namibian people, and the puppet régime which it has attempted to impose disappeared into thin air at the beginning of this year. South Africa keeps going thanks to an armed dictatorship which, supported from outside and guaranteed impunity, is extending its aggression and occupation of the territory of others to neighbouring countries, particularly Angola, Mozambique and Zambia.

48. Another fact, no less significant when one looks at the record of the Namibian situation, relates to the result of the action undertaken by the contact group, which volunteered its assistance to bring about a peaceful settlement. In spite of its good intentions so often affirmed, and which we appreciate, the contact group has not been able, over the last five years, to discharge the task which it set itself very willingly. The only net result of the work of those five years seems to be that the contact group has helped South Africa to gain time to consolidate its entrenchment and to exploit the vast riches of Namibian territory more successfully.

49. Fettered by its own contradictory interests, the contact group has rather become a brake on the process of Namibian independence, which is and must remain the final goal. That is not an accusation but a simple statement of fact, and we hope that our friends, the members of the contact group, will understand us properly. In the course of five years of effort, the contribution of the contact group to the settlement of the Namibian problem is unfortunately far from that hoped for. This is affirmed by SWAPO and our own country, Benin.

50. Five years in the life of an oppressed people struggling for its freedom and independence is a great deal, and it is too much. The good will of the individual members of the contact group will determine whether, in spite of everything, we shall place our continued, albeit eroded, confidence in that group.

51. It is for the Council to take a calm decision. Our analysis may seem simplistic to some, but we earnestly hope that the members of the contact group themselves will prove us wrong in our assessment by implementing, before December 1983, the provisions of resolution 435 (1978).

52. Be that as it may, it is up to those members of the group that do not always share certain of its approaches, or have felt it necessary, like France, to dissociate themselves publicly from certain manoeuvres, to lead the way for the members that wish only a neo-colonial type of independence for Namibia, or are striving to link Namibian independence to extraneous issues.

53. To link the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola to the process of the decolonization of Namibia is tantamount not only to meddling in affairs that concern two sovereign States, but also to facilitating and indemnifying crimes daily committed by the soldiery of South Africa against the independent States and peoples of that region. It is also an attempt to rob the Namibian problem of its true dimensions, that is to say, as a manifestation of colonial domination and a violation of the principles and objectives of the Charter of the United Nations as well as of the decisions and resolutions of the Organization.

54. We should like, however, to stress publicly, with appreciation, as we have not ceased to do in private, the positive individual acts of certain members of the contact group—to wit, the Federal Republic of Germany and France—acts that might have contributed decisively to a solution of the problem before us if those contact group members had not been thwarted in their efforts by the solidarity which the group is supposed to observe among its members. We urge those countries to pursue their efforts, even outside the contact group, and we hope that their good intentions *vis-à-vis* the Namibian problem will soon bear fruit and thus demonstrate that the confidence reposed in them has not been in vain.

55. The tragedy of Namibia is not just the illegal occupation of a Territory; it is not just the denial of the most basic rights of a people; it is not just *apartheid* and racism; it is the unabashed exploitation of a people, the ruthless plundering of its resources, and this in defiance of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted on 27 September 1974 by the United Nations Council for Namibia.[1]

56. The rate at which these corporations are plundering the country will inevitably lead, in the final analysis, to the exhaustion of its resources—which cannot fail to have disastrous effects on the future economic life and viability of an independent Namibia. There is every reason to believe that they wish first of all to exhaust the significant natural resources of Namibia before permitting it to accede to independence, in order to place in a difficult situation any authentic future administration of that country, which will thus be forced into economic dependence upon South Africa.

57. It is high time to put an end to this vast conspiracy. It is time to put an end to the enslavement and exploitation of the Namibian people. The international community can no longer tolerate the arrogance and the constant defiance of the two black sheep of the Organization, Israel and South Africa, the numerous misdeeds of whose unholy alliance have too long gone unpunished.

58. It is therefore left to the Council, strong in its prerogatives, to adopt whatever firm and effective measures are necessary to further the Namibian cause and to guarantee the long-suffering Namibian people the immediate exercise of their inalienable rights. In this regard, the conclusions of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence,[2] the report of the Secretary-General [*ibid.*] and the important statement of the President of SWAPO, our brother Sam Nujoma [***2439th meeting***], are all documents of the highest importance, which should inspire and guide the members of the Council in their deliberations, whose importance for the non-aligned countries requires no further demonstration.

59. The Council must, *inter alia*, reaffirm the relevance of all the resolutions of the Organization on this question, resolutions confirming the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence, affirming the integrity of their Territory, including Walvis Bay and the other islands off the Namibian coast, and condemning the *apartheid* régime for its crimes and its shameless exploitation of the resources of the Namibian people.

60. The Council must categorically reject all attempts to establish a link or a parallel between the independence of Namibia and problems which have nothing to do with that issue, in particular, the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola.

61. The Council must, above all, revitalize the United Nations plan approved in resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978), adopted unanimously by the Council, by requiring that it be implemented immediately without any restriction, modification, or escape clause. In other words, the Council must create the necessary conditions to make the independence of Namibia the reality of realities before December 1983.

62. What is happening in Namibia is not just a flagrant and persistent violation of international law; it is also a crime against humanity and a permanent denial of the dignity and identity of man.

63. The time has come, therefore, for the Council to impose comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa in accordance with Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

64. The Benin delegation, for its part, wishes to reaffirm its position of principle of total support for the just struggle of the Namibian people and to congratulate the United Nations Council for Namibia, which, under the leadership of its President, Mr. Paul Lusaka of Zambia, is sparing no effort to discharge its responsibilities as the legal Administering Authority of Namibia until independence.

65. To all oppressed peoples fighting for independence, freedom, national unity and territorial integrity—particularly the Palestinian people, the Sahrawi people, the people of Cyprus and the people of Timor fighting for the liberation of their territories from the grip of the colonizing invader of the twentieth century—the revolutionary people of Benin will never cease to offer their active support and solidarity in the most practical fashion in so far as they are able.

66. Our delegation wishes to pay a well-deserved tribute to the valiant peoples of the front-line States, particularly those of Zambia, Mozambique and, above all, Angola, for the tremendous sacrifices they have constantly made to thwart the repeated acts of aggression by Pretoria, which is using Namibian territory as a springboard for subversive and destabilizing operations against the other States of the region. Benin reaffirms its total solidarity with the front-line peoples, who enjoy the unreserved support of the OAU and the Non-Aligned Movement.

67. The Benin delegation expresses the hope that, on this occasion, the Council will measure up to its respon-

sibilities and not disappoint the hopes that the international community and the people of Namibia have placed in it—hopes of seeing the valiant people of Namibia exercising freely and immediately their inalienable right to independence under the leadership of SWAPO.

68. It will depend on the Security Council whether the final, inevitable victory of the Namibian people will be that of the gun or the olive branch. Ready for the revolution, the struggle continues!

69. Mr. TINOCO FONSECA (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Although my delegation has had an opportunity to congratulate Mr. Umba di Lutete on Zaire's assumption of the presidency of the Council, I should like to take this opportunity to express my delegation's pleasure at your excellent conduct of our discussions this month when there has been a great deal of hard work. This prompts us to believe that the entire international community, Africa and, in particular, the people of Namibia will in the course of this debate benefit greatly from your leadership.

70. We wish also to extend our best wishes to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the non-aligned countries who are taking part in this debate. We bid welcome in a spirit of solidarity to Comrade Sam Nujoma, President of heroic SWAPO, and are delighted to have him with us.

71. Five years after the adoption of resolution 435 (1978) and more than half a century after South African military forces entered the Territory, peace, freedom and independence for the people of Namibia are still goals that necessitate hard work.

72. We hope that this debate will be a starting-point in our efforts to achieve the goals that we have set ourselves, which are not only an aspiration of the people of Namibia but also an objective of the entire international community.

73. A sense of frustration has permeated the atmosphere owing to the impossibility of achieving substantive progress in the process of Namibia's independence; self-seeking forces are feverishly at work trying to maintain an intolerable *status quo* that benefits only those who with impunity exploit Namibia's wealth and profit from the fact that South Africa is a mercenary State.

74. The colonial occupation of Namibia is illegal from every point of view, according to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 21 June 1971[4] and the overwhelming verdict of the whole world.

75. It must be stressed that at this stage, 12 years after the advisory opinion of the Court was handed down, the scourge afflicting the people of Namibia has assumed intolerable proportions. Foreign interests and transnational corporations are relentlessly plundering the Territory's wealth and depriving the people of Namibia of their undeniable heritage, in open violation of Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia[3] and numerous resolutions of the General Assembly, all to the benefit of the South African régime, which is dramatically strengthening its hand and reaping many advantages as a result of its fruitful relations with those who are exploiting the wealth that belongs to the people of Namibia alone.

76. In spite of the laudable willingness of SWAPO, the sole legitimate representative of the people of Namibia, to seek a peaceful solution of this colonial problem, day after day South Africa is raising more obstacles to this process of independence or altering its true nature. In the April issue of *Africa Now*, a report was published to the effect that South Africa is promoting an independence plan for Namibia that would involve the dismemberment of the Territory. According to that "independence plan", the northern part of the Territory, that is, the part bordering on Angola, would be given to the counter-revolutionary Angolan puppet, Jonas Savimbi, and, in keeping with Pretoria's calculations, that would make it possible for the whites in the remainder of the Territory to become the most numerous ethnic group and guarantee that they would retain power and be able to continue the well-known practices of *apartheid* and bantustanization, thus more easily extending their role as a United States-type policeman in southern Africa. The plan is abominable from every point of view and stands little chance of success, but it gives us a clear idea of the true intentions of Pretoria with regard to the decolonization of Namibia.

77. Nevertheless, we are absolutely convinced that South Africa's intransigence is neither spontaneous nor born of a feeling of independent self-sufficiency. Its irrational attitude is based on the unswerving support it receives from a permanent member of the Council, which does not hesitate to display its friendly attitude towards the racist Pretoria régime, with which it obviously shares certain values and aspirations.

78. It was the United States that, in 1981, when it appeared that significant progress was being made in the talks on Namibian independence, invented for South Africa the pretext of the presence of Cuban troops in Angola and their withdrawal as a condition of the granting of independence to the Territory. South Africa has managed to make good use of this contribution by the United States, but the international community has vigorously and unambiguously rejected that manoeuvre, while SWAPO, with justice on its side, has taken appropriate action.

79. In January of this year at Harare in the presence of Chester Crocker, the United States representative at the negotiations, Comrade Sam Nujoma, the leader of SWAPO, stated:

> "The Reagan Administration introduced a collateral issue that has led to an impasse in the negotiations on Namibia over the past six months. Washington's insistence on linking Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola has provided South Africa with a convenient excuse for delay-

ing the implementation of the United Nations plan for independence."

80. One clear objective of the United States is to create obstacles and conditions that are unacceptable not only to the people of Namibia but also to the other members of the contact group. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of France, Mr. Claude Cheysson, at the recent International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, openly criticized the attempt to link the two issues, and it is known that other Western countries do not accept that linkage. It would seem that the world has become polarized on this issue, with the United States and South Africa at one extreme and the international community at the other.

81. In its resolution 37/233 B of 20 December 1982, the General Assembly firmly rejected the persistent attempts by the United States and South Africa to establish any linkage or parallelism between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola, a manoeuvre that is aimed solely at slowing down the decolonization process in Namibia and constitutes interference in the internal affairs of Angola.

82. That rejection was also reflected in the joint communiqué issued by the Government of Nicaragua and a mission of consultation of the United Nations Council for Namibia when the mission visited Managua on 21 and 22 April 1983.[5]

83. The Seventh Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in March this year at New Delhi, referred to the matter in the following terms:

> "In this connection, the Conference most categorically rejected the linkage or parallelism being drawn by the United States Administration between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. This continued insistence constitutes an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola." [*See S/15675 and Corr.1 and 2, annex, sect. I, para. 48.*]

More recently, the front-line States, in the communiqué issued following the meeting of heads of State or Government held at Dar es Salaam, on 12 May of this year, with reference to this already refuted argument,

> "reiterated their rejection of the United States policy according to which the independence of Namibia was subject to the withdrawal of Cuban forces fron Angola. They affirm that such insistence undermines efforts to implement the United Nations plan and thereby serves to perpetuate South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia."

84. We fully support the approach taken by the Secretary-General in his further report on the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on this subject. This is what he says:

> "Unfortunately . . . the positive side of the balance sheet has been set back by the emergence of other issues which were neither raised nor envisaged at the time when resolution 435 (1978) was adopted or in the subsequent negotiations under United Nations auspices. These issues now apparently constitute the main reason for the delay in the implementation of the United Nations plan. I am deeply concerned that factors which lie outside the scope of resolution 435 (1978) should hamper its implementation." [*S/15776, para. 19.*]

85. There is therefore an overwhelming international agreement with regard both to the unavowed intention behind that manoeuvre and to its inappropriateness. Nevertheless, its sponsors continue to persist with it.

86. This of course means that the United States now finds itself at odds with all of Africa. The entire continent has forged a monolithic and indestructible united front against South Africa and its abhorrent system of ***apartheid***, its policy of destabilization and aggression against the front-line States and its unlawful colonial occupation of Namibia. Yet the United States continues to stand by South Africa. Its position is particularly eloquent, a clear example of the parameters used to measure democracy and freedom by one that calls the criminal ex-Somozist guards "freedom fighters", and describes as "terrorists" the Namibians who are fighting to liberate their unlawfully occupied territory, a territory that has been plundered and whose people have been brutally repressed. Africa—like the Arab nation—must not lose sight of the fact that in this regard the choices of the United States have already been made: *apartheid* and Zionism, abominable creations spawned by the same empire.

87. We have recently been informed of the latest aggression by South Africa against Mozambique. We are deeply outraged and we unhesitatingly express our strong rejection of this action. That, then, is the kind of peace that is intended for southern Africa. Nicaragua requests the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Mozambique to convey its sincere feelings of solidarity to the people and Government of Mozambique.

88. There is, however, an even greater danger. The development of South Africa's nuclear capability, which would be impossible without the transfer of technology by certain Powers, entails unimaginable risks of destruction and suffering, not only for southern Africa but for the whole of that continent. The newspaper *The Star*, of Johannesburg, in its issue dated 3 May, in an article entitled "South Africa able to produce 15 nuclear bombs", reports on the level of nuclear technology achieved by the Pretoria régime. I should like to read a brief excerpt from that article:

> "South Africa now has enough enriched uranium for 15 nuclear bombs and could have enough for 60 bombs by 1987. This point is made in a study of nuclear-weapons potential carried out by a major American newspaper chain recently and read into the

Congressional Record by Senator William Proxmire, a Democrat from Wisconsin. Senator Proxmire referred to the report as extraordinarily well documented and said it underlined the urgent need to stop the spread of nuclear weapons."*

89. We are quite sure that, if those Powers with strong economic, political and military links with South Africa were to exert constant pressure on that country, the possibilities of a solution to the colonial problem before us would become much greater. The attitude of SWAPO and its willingness to co-operate with the United Nations in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978) greatly contribute to the only solution acceptable in this case, an independent Namibia with its territory intact, including Walvis Bay and the adjacent islands. Any attempt to fragment the Territory is quite unacceptable.

90. The decolonization of Namibia cannot be postponed. We should like to see a willingness on the part of all the permanent members of the Council to act in support of the people of Namibia and not against them. The disheartening veto of 1981 must be relinquished to history and buried. We must act decisively; the action should not be limited to the sacrifices and heroism of the Namibian people; it is a task for all of us and for the Council in particular.

91. The Secretary-General, with his customary common sense, prudence and insight, has informed us in his recent report:

> "It is evident that the delay in implementing resolution 435 (1978) is having a destructive impact not only on Namibia itself but also on the prospect of a peaceful and prosperous future for the region as a whole. The delay also has an adverse effect on international relations in a wider sphere, adding to the prevailing sense of frustration and mistrust, with all that that implies for peace and security in the region." [*Ibid., para. 16.*]

92. For that reason, the role of the Council on this occasion, in exercise of the mandate assigned to it by the international community, is important for two reasons. On the one hand, it must uphold the inalienable right of the people of Namibia through the implementation of resolution 435 (1978); and, on the other hand, it must ensure the maintenance of international peace and security, thereby putting an end to an intolerable and anachronistic situation which, if prolonged, could lead to an aggravation of the conflict. We cannot evade our obligation. Under General Assembly resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, Namibia is the direct responsibility of the United Nations, but the attainment of its independence largely depends on our forthrightness and determination in facing this challenge.

93. The International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence appealed to us to take immediate action, and it did so in the following terms:

> "The Conference, therefore, calls upon the Security Council to meet at the earliest possible date to consider further action on the implementation of its plan for Namibia's independence, thereby assuming its primary responsibility for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Five years after the adoption of that resolution it is high time that the Security Council assumed fully the central role in its implementation and established the Council's own time-frame for such implementation."[6]

94. Whereas the contact group has been unable in five years to carry out the tasks it assumed and whereas the outlook is rather gloomy in this area, the Secretary-General, in the opinion of my delegation, is in a position to play a decisive role in the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Nicaragua would support such a wise assignment, which could only further the process of independence and thereby benefit the people of Namibia.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

---

* Quoted in English by the speaker.

NOTES

[1] *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), part one, para. 31.

[2] *Ibid.*, part three, paras. 166-195.

[3] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 24*, vol. I, annex II.

[4] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971*, p. 16.

[5] See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 24*, para. 879, sect. 2(*d*).

[6] *Report of the International Conference in Support of the Struggle of the Namibian People for Independence, Paris, 25-29 April 1983* (A/CONF.120/13), part three, para. 193.